

To: Kumar, Ashij (EC/EC)[ashij.kumar@canada.ca]
From: Schardt, James
Sent: Tue 12/15/2015 2:49:02 PM
Subject: RE: Mike's comments on Nutrient Annex Progress Report of the Parties

Susan didn't provide written comments on the Nutrient chapter. I suspect Jen/Mike's email will prompt Susan to talk with Tinka.

From: Kumar, Ashij (EC/EC) [mailto:ashij.kumar@canada.ca]
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 1:48 PM
To: Schardt, James <schardt.james@epa.gov>
Subject: Mike's comments on Nutrient Annex Progress Report of the Parties

Do you have a set of comments from Susan on the Nutrients chapter? Did you see Mike's comments below? Can we at some point touch base on this and figure out when we'll incorporate both GLEC co-chairs' comments and then send out the draft to co-leads and when to setup a call with the writing team if needed?

After Dec 22 (surgery) I'll be out of commission and not sure for how long.

From: McKay, Jennifer (EC/EC)
Sent: December 10, 2015 1:59 PM
To: 'hedman.susan@epa.gov'
Cc: Goffin, Michael (EC/EC); korleski.christopher@epa.gov
Subject: FW: REVIEW: Nutrient Annex Progress Report of the Parties

Good afternoon Susan,

Mike asked me to send you his comments on draft Nutrient Annex chapter of the Progress Report of the Parties.

Jennifer

From: Goffin, Michael (EC/EC)
Sent: December 3, 2015 6:38 PM
To: McKay, Jennifer (EC/EC)
Subject: REVIEW: Nutrient Annex Progress Report of the Parties

Always difficult to take the first stab at these things. So thanks to authors for this. Here are

some comments for consideration.

1. Important for us to get the tone and style right / agreement on these. A less formal and more action oriented style would make the document more easy to read and shorten text considerably.

Read the Canada-United States Air Quality Accord Progress Report 2010 for style.

<http://www.ijc.org/files/tinymce/uploaded/documents/2010%20Progress%20report%20on%20the%20Air%20Q>

2. Delete Overview section. It doesn't add anything in terms of content and takes up a lot of space (10 annexes = 10 overviews @ ½ page per = a 5 page savings if deleted)

3. Discussion of state of the lakes can be less formal and more informative. I would suggest these serve as opening of each Annex.

Example: "Environmental monitoring has demonstrated significant increases in toxic algae (cyanobacteria) formation in the western and central portions of Lake Erie while nuisance algae (cladophora) has increased in the eastern portion of the lake. Increased algae formation is also occurring in some nearshore areas of lakes Huron, Michigan and Ontario. Algae formation in the Great Lakes can be controlled by limiting phosphorus discharges. Primary sources of phosphorus to the Great Lakes are agricultural runoff, and discharges from sewage treatment plants.

4. With that short intro to the issue, I would suggest moving right into binational action.

Example: "Binational Action to reduce phosphorus discharges.

Canada and the United States are working to address this important issue with a focus on Lake Erie where impacts are greatest. A coordinated approach to research and monitoring supported the development of draft phosphorus reduction targets for the Western and Central basins of Lake Erie; work to develop phosphorus reduction targets for the eastern Lake Erie is continuing. These draft targets were the subject of binational public consultations in the summer of 2015. The phosphorus reduction targets shown in table x were formally agreed to by Canada and the United States in February 2016 and replace the interim targets contained in the 2012 GLWQA.

5. Suggest we not use the document to list Priorities for Science and Action. Instead we should make the priorities the focus of reporting where feasible. This would also save space. (10 annexes = 10 tables showing priorities @ 2/3 page per = savings of 6 to 7 pages)

6. Suggest we delete reference to 99% of work groups and other process steps. Only include if

highly significant to success.

7. Suggest delete table format for Domestic Action. It wastes space and kills flow of document.

8. On Domestic Action, in each country section, I think we need to have a high level, short, overview of how the issue is managed.

Example: “ In Canada phosphorus discharges are controlled under t5he Government of Canada’s xxx Act, and through Ontario’s yyy and zzz Acts.

Then move into domestic actions which either fall under these programs or supplement them.

Example: “In 2016 Agriculture Canada launched the Growing Forward 2 initiative to do x, y and z. Support to the development and implementation of 450 Environmental farm Plans under this initiative are helping to reduce phosphorus discharges from agricultural lands through application of best management practices.”